POPULAR UPRISING

The Manifesto of the Popular Party

Lucas Peters

Popular Party

First published June 17, 2026

Copyright © 2026 Popular Party

All rights reserved.

No portion of this book may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the publisher or author, except as permitted by U.S. copyright law.

Contents

Face Tomorrow	2
Functional Representation	13
The Cult of Consensus	25
Ascend Through the Spiral	35
American Eschaton	61

Dedicated to Whom It May Concern.

Face Tomorrow

I want things to be beautiful.

People are numb. We forget we have a choice.

It's like we're at the end of history. Endless sequels. Reboots of reboots. Remixes of remixes. The endless rotation of recycled trends. The perpetual vibe shift that announces a new era every few months without one ever arriving. Our society is saturated with nostalgia. People debate whether we peaked in the '50s or the '90s, or some other time, but "today" is never an answer. Nobody thinks the future is real.

"Stuck culture." "Nothing ever happens."

This week yet another country bombed. Another mass shooting. Another man killed by the police. Another poor young woman killed by some lunatic with a rap sheet long enough to fill a Bible. Another scandal, another outrage, another violation of public trust. Forgotten immediately by next week's news cycle.

Economic stagnation. Delayed family formation. Frozen social mobility. The loneliness epidemic. Demographic collapse. Rampant mental illness. Deaths of despair. An entire generation with its youth confiscated and its adulthood shaping up to be just as barren.

There's a new tragedy every hour and everyone just looks away.

We choose not to see. How can things be beautiful?

It's not for lack of trying. You've all tried. Left, Right, and Center. People have been trying to fix this country for decades and it's never worked. This numbness, it's the signature output of a failing order that has hyperconstricted productive possibility-space. It's learned helplessness on a civilizational scale. People lose hope. We forget we have options.

In the current system, "doing what you're supposed to do" is a crapshoot and the only consistently rewarded behavior is grifting. A political order is a reward function. What it rewards, it produces more of. The actors within our society need to be rewarded for correct behavior, that is, behavior that is beneficial to the public good. The current order rewards rent-seeking, regulatory arbitrage, credentialism, and performative compliance. This is not a failure of the system, it is the system's designed output. The system does not malfunction. The dissonance comes from the difference

between the system's declared purpose and actual purpose.

Activists target one face of the system. They isolate one node. They protest policing, politicians, parties, banks, media corporations. Their dissent is easily contained. Protest becomes another brand that can be marketed and profited from. Political backlash against one politician, platform, party, is weaponized by its opposition within the same system, who will always pull the rug out from under their grassroots supporters. Playing this way the house always wins, and the pessimists become right. Protestors and political agitators become their own gatekeepers, redirecting their own attention, energy, and resources away from the source of what it is they're really fighting against: *the Regime*.

When the Regime gives its protestors what they want, the monkey's paw curls. Protest the war? They let the terrorists win. Protest police brutality? They stop policing poor neighborhoods. When the two-party system cannot destroy a movement, the protestors are not denied. The Regime delivers them the most degraded, spiteful, administratively convenient version of what they wanted. Whether the dissenters win or lose, nothing changes, and people start believing that nothing can change.

The Tea Party wanted bank reform and fiscal restraint. They got Tea Party branded Republicans who delivered what Republicans

always deliver: tax cuts and empty culture war platitudes. The movement was metabolized in less than 18 months. The "victory" of the 2010 midterms was the moment the movement died.

The Alt-Right is an even cleaner example of the Regime behaving like a spiteful genie. They wanted "civilizational renewal" and explicit identity politics. They wanted to elect Trump. Trump won. They got a couple years of mainstream permission to be loud and obnoxious, followed by mass deplatforming and prosecutions as soon as their guy got into office. Many who supported Trump got stabbed in the back, and he became one of the most unpopular presidents in modern U.S. history. Their victory did nothing but hand their enemies the cause to suppress them. The Alt-Right wanted a new aristocracy and they got a con man who paints everything gold.

Occupy Wall Street wanted to break finance capital. They committed to leaderless resistance as a principle. So they had no one to negotiate and no coherent demands to negotiate for. Structureless, the movement saw Democrats steal rhetoric about "the 99%" and ignore everything else. Wall Street continued to write government policy because the principles that founded the Occupy movement guaranteed that whatever survived would be only what its enemies were willing to permit.

The Libertarian Party has been running candidates for over half a century. They have never once won a federal office. They have never once broken double digits in a presidential election. They sincerely believe that a third party will eventually win just because the two-party system is bad, and moreover, that this third party will somehow be them. Fundamentally they lose because they're an unserious party that doesn't want to win. They run for big federal offices as a kind of principled protest without actually doing anything to build the support networks that they would need to get anything out of their victories if they had them. Furthermore, they don't actually promise any vision for the future or any real alternative to the current way of things that's worth taking a risk on. They're Republicans who smoke weed. Anyone competent just gets poached by the Republican Party. They're a release valve that thinks it's outside the system.

The Green Party is the same thing for the other half. Decades of running, no federal victories. The 2000 election is eternally held over their heads. They wanted environmental and progressive politics and it got us the Iraq War. In practice, they only exist to reinforce the narrative that alternatives can't work and only make things worse.

Even in the hypothetical situation where one or both of these parties displaced the major parties, would it make a real difference?

They would become captured by the same voting blocs, the same donor bases, most of the same institutions, forced to work within the same legal architecture, the same national pool of available staffing personnel. Some small things would change, but the incentive structures shaping available decision trees would remain the same. A world with the Greens and the Libertarians would just be a rebrand of the world with the Democrats and Republicans. The most important structural problems that America faces would not be solved.

Infiltrationist strategies about co-opting one of the major parties or another to make it serve your ends are a pipe dream. It's mechanically impossible. By joining the Regime, you are making your success contingent on its success. Your win conditions are its reward functions. Any grand dream about the direction you want to steer the country toward is in opposition to what decisions you have to make to succeed in that environment. You do not capture the party. The party captures you.

The two-party system is a duopoly performing competition. It gatekeeps the system from outsiders while performing the fiction of open democratic competition. We're living with all of the downsides of a one-party state with none of the benefits. The duopoly is like two sales departments of the same firm, each capturing different demographics while delivering the same

product: continuity of the Regime. People say the parties fight constantly. They do. They fight over who gets to run the firm this season, not whether the firm should exist. The firm always wins.

Where the two parties openly cooperate is where the duopoly is most apparent. Ballot access laws. Debate qualification rules. Campaign finance structures. Primary calendars. Federal Election Commission rules. Closed donor and media networks. Winner-takes-all incentives. Their conflict is only real at the personnel and cultural level. When a real movement with its own energy and its own base appears outside the duopoly, the parties do not fight it. They compete to absorb it. Whoever absorbs it gains a new voting bloc. Whichever fails gains a new scarecrow to frighten their own base with. The duopoly poaches any real talent from political dissenters, leaving them impotent and barren. What we're left with is performative dissent. The consistent failure of dissident political actors to provide any desirable, let alone plausible alternative, has the whole country convinced that no such alternative could ever exist. Meanwhile they have us fighting each other over which evil is the lesser.

The duopoly has one supreme anxiety: that someone might see past it entirely. Not that voters might choose the other side, not that the voters might choose neither, but that someone will target what's behind them. The Regime has

two components, the constitutional order and paraconstitutional institutions that both depend on each other in order to function. The duopoly is one paraconstitutional structure among many. If the duopoly failed, the Regime would grow a new one.

Most political resistance in America is not strategic. It is moral theater. People protest to relieve internal guilt, prove righteousness, demonstrate compassion, or absolve themselves of complicity. Their enemy, predictably, only has to give them symbolic release. Moral orders do not generate themselves. They are the cultural exhaust of whichever power produced and now sustains them. Normativity is a consequence of power. The morality you use to judge the Regime was shaped by the Regime. Your self-righteous indignation is another of its instruments.

Dissident political movements have one thing in common, they put their morals first and make strategy secondary if they have any strategy at all. One moral order is not overcome by another through sermons alone. You often hear people say they support some such issue, cause, or movement, without meaningfully doing anything to advance that agenda. A moral order can only be overcome by a power that establishes a different one. The Regime tells you belief alone changes the world because belief alone is the kind of resistance it can't possibly lose to. The

only meaningful act of rebellion left is to stop moralizing and get to work.

Mass politics works. Mass movements are just about the only thing that has ever produced positive feedback. But that energy needs the right vehicle and the right destination. Most recent failures failed at both. Yet they've given us an abundance of negative data. If a method repeatedly produces absorption, dissipation, capture, paralysis — failure, then that method has been falsified. If we're going to fix this country, we need to know how we're getting there. We need to employ the scientific method constantly, test our theory through praxis, and be open to that theory being falsified and adapt quickly. More importantly, we need to know where we're going. We need a plausible alternative that addresses the core failure modes of the current system without overcorrecting. Before that, we need to define exactly what it is that we're replacing.

The Regime has no succession method because no sovereign office is being succeeded. What it has are mechanisms for personnel replacement. The Regime reproduces itself through processes that include no point at which the people actually decide. Elections, conventions, ratifications are effectively just rituals. The people do not decide the Regime's direction, they ratify from a selection of curated choices. Every four years, there is a transfer of office without a transfer of power.

If power does not transfer, then it is held somewhere. Sovereignty does not disappear because of checks and balances. It only redistributes itself somewhere those checks cannot reach. The pretense of distributed power is a cover for power that is in fact concentrated, only not in any place that any citizen can easily name or contest. The executive, the legislature, the courts, the states, the people. The system is designed to make sovereignty appear to be everywhere, and therefore effectively nowhere. In practice, the sovereign is the paraconstitutional ecosystem capable of deciding the exception. Which laws are enforced, which crises count as emergency, which institutions are legitimate, which candidates are viable, which scandals matter. They are unaccountable because they are nowhere named as a single body that could be held to account. The Regime's deepest achievement is that it has made its own sovereign unspeakable, unknowable, and therefore, uncontestable.

The failure points of prior anti-establishment political movements were, in some respects, forgivable mistakes. What all have done that is unforgivable, however, is to not know what it even is that they're succeeding. Mistakes in leadership, organization, ideology, these can be patched. This gravest failure is not a bug. They could not see the forest for the trees. The Regime is not any individual node or series of nodes.

The Regime is the whole constitutional-paraconstitutional order in its totality. Cut off one head and two grow back. Their failure that is so unforgivable is that they were not even attempting to succeed the Regime but only operating inside of it. They did not know what they were trying to replace, so they were incapable of replacing it. “Regime change” is not a slogan for putting different people in the same offices. It is not a slogan for changing policy at the margins. It is not a slogan for dethroning a handful of oligarchs while leaving their replacement mechanisms intact. Regime change means replacing the entire system. This is the work the *Popular Party* exists to do.

Functional Representation

The Popular Party exists because America keeps misdiagnosing its own failure.

There's the personnel problem, that we need better leaders. The partisan problem, that the other party is the enemy. The moral problem, that we need better values, we need to act more righteously. The policy problem, that we just need the right reforms. The messaging problem, that good ideas fail because they aren't communicated well, or people just aren't educated enough. These are all red herrings. What we have is a representation problem. More than that, we have an epistemic problem.

The Greatest Lie that the government tells about itself is that it represents the people. This lack of representation is not a failure of the system. It is not a failure in leadership alone, either. This is the system functioning as designed. Federalism distributes sovereignty geographically. In the 18th century, before the

railroad and the telegraph, let alone all the technological advances of the 20th and 21st centuries, this was a defensible compromise. People were ultimately tied to the land they lived and worked on. Until the mid-20th century, communities were segregated, either totally or in part, not just by race and ethnicity, but also by denomination, class, and other fundamental differences in lifestyle. Geography as the basis of political organization was not arbitrary, it was a description of social reality. The territory was the community.

This is no longer the case, and it hasn't been broadly the case for as long as many of us have been alive. Today's representatives are tasked with the job of representing vast multitudes of different people with nothing in common but a zip code. Our elected officials are somehow supposed to represent people from all different backgrounds, different lifestyles, different perspectives, and different interests all at the same time. It's an impossible task; even the leaders who are truly dedicated to the public good have no choice but to fail. The end result is that no one ends up being spoken for except for those with the money and connections to make their voices heard louder than all the others. Everyone else is represented only in name and abandoned in fact.

The alternative follows once you determine what exactly it is that representation is doing.

The idea of representation as symbolic embodiment of the "will of the people" was the 18th-century ideal of what representation was supposed to do, but not what representation is actually observed to be as a process. Representation properly understood is information flowing upward. The people are selecting a representative to speak and vote on their collective behalf: it is the process by which the people make their voices heard. Representation is the architecture by which the state sees the conditions it governs. Maximizing the upward flow of real and useful information is necessary for maximizing representation.

The federal system fails at representation the moment the district expands past the point where the people voting together no longer share real interests. Democracy isn't preference aggregation. It is a means of falsification, the mechanism through which reality talks back to those in power and forces correction. *Functional Representation* is how we get back to real democracy.

Everyone who has ever worked within any structure at any level has executed a decision made by someone who had no idea what the fuck was going on. A directive from a boss who has never done the work. A policy that ignores every obvious real-world constraint because the policymaker has never lived within those

constraints. When those who decide don't pay, bad decisions are guaranteed.

Those who live within a domain carry its consequences. Their livelihood depends on knowing what's going on. Workers of labor. Property owners of property ownership. Soldiers of war. No one governs what they do not live within: that is Functional Representation.

The political domain is no different. Governance is a function. It requires expertise, sustained commitment, and above all, accountability that is specifically political. The current political class is not primarily accountable to the public good. They are accountable to financial interests, factional interests, and their own personal interests. A political class whose stake is genuinely political has none of these to serve. It answers to the order it administers because the order is all it has. Those who govern must live within what they govern, and within nothing else. Today's politicians go out of their way to stylize themselves as working class, public servants, and men of the people all while living like kings. The incentive structures of the Regime reward them for lying to you while they betray your interests and pamper themselves.

The political class of the successor order must be the inverse of this. A class that is truly constituted of servants. A political monastery. Their reward function cannot be contingent on holding office or what the office affords.

Their reward must come from the success of the order they administer and the success of the people they govern. The incentive structure must be aligned so precisely with the public good that service to any other interest becomes self-destruction. An office that cannot enrich its holder cannot be purchased. A political class that lives within and is subject to the order it governs has no incentive to govern against it.

What Functional Representation uniquely solves is the informational problem. The principle is simple: a representative who is what he represents knows it better than anyone else can. The merchant who works in commerce understands commerce more deeply than any congressman who has only ever read about it. The farmer who brought in the harvest understands agricultural conditions from experience in a way no agency that has only surveyed them can. The soldier who has fought in the trenches understands war in a way no civilian appointee ever will. These representatives are not infallible, but they are working from direct contact with the reality they're tasked with speaking for. They are harder to deceive in their own field. The information they surface has better context and fewer distortions from intermediaries. The governed and the governing are not separated by the representative structure, but continuous with each other through that very structure of representation. This is not romanticism about

the good honest working man and his plight against the entitled white-collar office workers of society. Finance is a function. Banking is a function. Clerical work is a function. Functional Representation is epistemic architecture.

Epistemic engineering is what follows. The Regime has more data than any state in human history but it is epistemically blind. It drowns in information but cannot see. Functional Representation surfaces usable information about real functions. Territorial representation must surface real information about real territories. The political monastery ensures that the apparatus serving these functions does not corrupt the process with personal interest. The whole system needs to be designed for sight. The process must ensure that real-world data is accurately collected and processed into useful information that accurately models real-world conditions. For the people to be represented they must be seen and they must be heard.

Functional Representation is not so much a proposed machine as it is a governing philosophy. It's the principle that will be used to judge all future machines. This document exists to outline the mission and worldview of the Popular Party. It exists to identify problems and solutions on the level of first principles.

Policy follows worldview. Policy without worldview is only administration. Any movement that begins with policy suffocates itself under the

weight of administration it does not yet have the capacity to carry. Specifics will always have to change when the idea meets reality. It is better to draft a clear worldview, a clear direction that future policy can be derived from, than it is to start with policy, and try to revise it through reverse engineering to fit future needs later.

Theory is only as good as what it builds.

This is what every failed dissident movement could not produce: leaders who did the work of building the institution rather than the work of producing more theory about the institution. The dissident right has spent fifteen years debating its own positions and has produced nothing operational. The dissident left has spent even longer with the same results. They have produced more theoretical content than any prior dissident generation in American history and nothing to show for it.

When dissident movements are not producing more theory, they are policing each other. Cancel culture is its most visible form, but the underlying pattern is universal amongst dissident factions: ideological purity tests, expulsion of insufficiently committed allies, public denunciation as movement-building activity. None of this builds anything. They are cargo-culting institutional discipline when they lack the institutional structure that would make such discipline meaningful. It's all debate and no praxis, which is the only thing that could

actually prove any theory true or false. Every hour that is spent cancelling an insufficiently pure ally is an hour not spent building something. The movements are eating themselves through the very norm enforcement that is supposed to signal their seriousness about their cause.

They are acting as though correct moral commitments produce political capacity. This is exactly backwards. The moral order of a society is what its institutions produce through the reward functions they present, the discipline they impose, the culture they cultivate, and the rewards and punishments they distribute. Without the institutional foundation, moral commitments are pure abstractions. Commitment to abstract moral norms that aren't actually present or socially enforced in real life is just complete schizo nonsense.

The only moral norm that any young political movement actually has the ability to have or enforce is party loyalty. Expulsion is the only mechanism the party has. When abstract ideology is the entire basis of your imaginary movement, of course it devolves into ideological purity tests. That is the entire basis of participation.

The Popular Party is not putting the ideological cart before the institutional horse. We design the architecture, we build the architecture, the moral norms proceed from that architecture. As a young organization, we recognize the limits

of expulsion and only enforce what expulsion can presently address: loyalty to the party and its director. The member is loyal or he is expelled. What he thinks about contested questions outside of his vocation within the party cannot be our concern. We can't be concerned with thought crime. What the architecture of the new order produces will become moral, what the architecture destroys will become immoral. The productive order will be served because the architecture will reward productive contribution at every altitude and structurally exclude the parasitic, not because we will impose a creed or doctrine of "productive virtue" on members who do not yet inhabit the institutions that will make productive virtue real.

This is what allows us to be a party of genuinely distinct individuals with different views on contested questions outside of the institutional vision. The atheist and the Christian. The traditionalist and the progressive. All can serve together because constructing the architecture itself is the moral work. The work of building what will produce the moral order of the future is the most morally serious work that any of us can do. There is no higher moral work available to a man in our present situation than building the institution that will replace the Regime. Anyone who has decided to take this commitment upon himself has chosen the most consequential moral action of the present age.

This is why we seek power openly. The dissident movements have moralized the pursuit of authority, performed reluctance to wield it, and preferred the position of self-righteous outsider to the responsibilities of governance. We refuse this. Power is the precondition for building the new order. To refuse power is to refuse the work. To refuse power is moral cowardice.

Their concern is how their contemporaries judge them. We measure ourselves by how history will judge us.

There will be no second masters. We refuse to cooperate with either party. No endorsements, no coalitions, no sponsorships, nothing. We will not compromise. Any member among us who cooperates with the Regime will be exiled. Our absorption will be mechanically impossible. We are the duopoly's greatest fear: that someone refuses to bargain entirely. The Popular Party will not be bought. We are not an election brand to be rented out to ambitious men. We are a movement larger than any one man's ambition.

The Popular Party stands for the people alone. We do not represent a geography or a demographic. We represent the productive order: those who build, those who serve, those who design, those who create. We will be opposed by those who profit from the Regime's dysfunction at the public's expense, and rightly so. We will end economic parasitism. Our platform is Functional Representation. The people deserve

to be represented for what they do, not just where they live. Decisions will belong to those who pay the price for those decisions. The Popular Party represents the people who act.

The Popular Party will not be dragged into irrelevant culture war bullshit. This is not a subculture. We will not be divided by superficial performances in ideological purity. We will not be divided by race, class, sexuality. We are united together through action. We are not an idea. We are an organization. We are here to work. The Popular Party has visible leadership, clear structure, and explicit aims. Our Party Director is named, accountable, and carries ultimate responsibility for the party's actions. Wielded with intention, superior maneuver becomes our weapon against the duopoly. We cannot beat them in size, money, or messaging, but we can beat them in leadership, speed, and organization. The Regime is sluggish. They are institutionally incapable of out-deciding. We will win through superior decision-cycle speed. The Regime cannot survive its own mistakes, it cannot adapt. We can.

The Popular Party is not going to run candidates for federal offices without first building the infrastructure that will make these victories meaningful. We build from the bottom. School boards, city councils, county offices. We are building a network, a support base, public trust, and a record of competence. We do not

contest big offices as some flaccid protest. We contest small offices to build a foundation, and with that foundation, we win.

The new political class does not appear out of nowhere. It does not wait until power is taken. It begins now in the party. We hold ourselves to the standards we will enforce. When a man joins, he is submitting to the order he is building. Membership is service, not an endorsement. To be a Popular is to be a servant of the public good. To be a loyal soldier in the struggle against the Regime.

The Regime is terminal. Anyone with eyes perceptive enough can see it, though who can know on what timeline. There is no third option, only this, or slow decay. Whether fate brings us glory, infamy, or obscurity, we face tomorrow.

The Cult of Consensus

The enemy here is nebulous. The Republicans. The Democrats. The capitalists. The socialists. This or that class, race, religion. The enemy is none of these things. There's the financial class. The legal class. The political class. The managerial class. They're all positioned in such a way that the optimal thing for them to do is to feed into each other's dysfunction. Here, too, the common people are forced by circumstance to make decisions they are not happy with. The enemy is the entire constitutional settlement and the class ecosystem it has generated and which sustains it. That is the Regime: this system we live under that we all help self-perpetuate, whether through action or inaction. You could replace every individual within it, and the outputs for every purpose that matters would remain equally as dysfunctional so long as the reward functions remain identical.

The Constitution was written at the scale of the original thirteen states. Even then, it wasn't entirely unproblematic and its ratification was not an easy process. The founders left us with a mountain of technical debt that only compounded as America grew. The constitutional order has no good internal mechanism for adapting to changes in scale. Every expansion of the state has required some kind of hacky workaround or a full-on crisis. Many say they love the Constitution, but this is like the woman who has fallen in love with her captor. To prove their love, they point to the amendments, changes tacked onto the constitution to attempt to fix something that is fundamentally broken. What they love is a civic mythology.

The core of the Constitution itself is a dysfunctional 18th-century compromise. That compromise is the entire basis that this multi-headed system of exploitation is predicated upon. The Constitution is the God of the Regime, through which all its authority is justified and carried out.

A theology cannot be reformed from within on any timeline that matters. The constitutional order *could* theoretically be amended, restructured, or reinterpreted. This has been done many times before, slowly, inadequately, lagging lifetimes behind social reality. The pace of internal reform is structurally insufficient to the scale of our

dysfunction. The pace of dysfunction only accelerates, accumulating and multiplying further dysfunction. It is impossible to reform the current system from within at scale, within time, before this whole house of cards comes falling down on us and we get left with a successor we didn't choose.

The Regime has no publicly intelligible telos beyond perpetuating itself. If at one point it possessed a telos, that has been interpreted away into nothing but dry ink on old parchment. Every crisis response, every policy, and every expansion is reactive, a patch on a patch on a patch. When sovereignty is hidden, no named decision-maker exists who could design anything purposefully.

The law is the whore of consensus. She gets passed around by every lawmaker, every oligarch, every faction that needed something from her, and we're the ones left violated and degraded.

When every faction has agreed the law is legitimate regardless of whatever it produces, regardless of who benefits, regardless of who pays, regardless of any intended design, this is the *Cult of Consensus*: the theology that transforms faction negotiation into popular mandate, degrades law into compliance product, and calls the result the will of the people. You agreed, everyone agreed, therefore, no violation occurred.

The men who passed her around, the men who wrote the laws, they do not live under them. The oligarchs who purchased her do not suffer

her pain. Those who decide do not pay. Those who pay do not decide.

It was the intention of our Founding Fathers that no man be above the law. That was the promise of the rule of law. Of course, like most of our laws today, this promise was kept literally without being kept in spirit. The Regime, as usual, behaving like a spiteful genie. The founders failed to recognize that there was a third position. The political class today may not be above the law, but neither are they under it. They are adjacent to it. Subject to the text while being insulated from its full weight. The men who vote to send soldiers to war do not send their sons. They send yours. The decision to go to war is made by those who will not fight it. They decide. You pay. This is the separation of stake from consequence. They call it "democracy."

This is not democracy. This is not even a republic. *Res publica*: the public thing, the state held in the people's name, for the people's interests. The republic was converted into private property held by an unnamable owner. The class that decides what you pay for owns what your payment produces. They retire into the firms that benefit from the policies they wrote. Their children are credentialed into the same positions. Their assets appreciate by the same legislation they write. It's feudal logic.

The Regime is an authoritarian state, though it refuses the title. This hidden

government, the paraconstitutional class that acts sovereign but refuses the burdens of sovereignty's responsibility, performs democracy while delivering oligarchy. It is Orwellian, and it is not named as such so long as there are bread and circuses. But what happens when depression hits, when the bread has run out and the circus skips town? It is not unthinkable. Over the long term it becomes certain. What then? The Regime has no contingency. We are chained to a sinking ship. The question is not whether it falls, it's what we have to stand on when it does.

America today is a country of financial speculation, regulatory arbitrage, litigation, and rent seeking. This is the behavior the Regime rewards. What happened to the America of builders, creators, producers? The America of industrious ambition and honest work? That America was outlawed. The presence of depression, pessimism, and nihilism is no shock. The hard overcorrection against explicit authoritarianism bore us this hidden authoritarianism and its rotten fruits. In trying to prevent the return of the Named Tyrant, the liberal constitutional order made sovereign power unnamable, which guaranteed it would migrate to the unaccountable paraconstitutional structures. The system of "checks and balances" was always self-defeating. Power remained and it moved to the places where visible checks and balances would never be possible. They learned

the lesson of the 20th century better than you did: never hold power visibly. Never be the thing history will judge. The Regime believes hiding behind manufactured consensus will shield them from consequence forever.

They will be made the lesson of the 21st century.

A state is not more democratic for hiding power from the people. Though the power is in more hands, they are not the people's hands; these hands are disguised from the public. Sovereign authority resides today in the margins of the constitutional order, in the seams between the offices where formal powers are said to be separated. This is not democracy. For a government to be truly democratic, power must be visible, answerable, and accountable to the public. Public officials cannot be held publicly accountable when it is always someone else's responsibility. The people cannot impeach a process, vote out a consensus, or demand accounting from a faceless committee. The people can, however, judge a leader whose responsibility is made clear before them. The liberal promise was never that no one would govern; it was that those who would govern would do so under the eyes of the people. Sovereignty diffused, hidden behind a fog of various institutions, can never be held to the people's account. A republic run by anonymous private interests is not a republic. Democracy

demands visible sovereignty. It demands that responsibility is publicly accountable to the people.

The Enlightenment thinkers were right about the degeneracy of hereditary rule. However, in abolishing this, they abolished ordeal with it. Consequence was replaced by procedure. The test of reality was replaced by administered examinations. This was the systemic dismantling of every mechanism by which the West had historically produced leaders capable of governing. Consequence has been insulated at every level. The Regime is the terminal expression of this project. Financial risk is socialized. Physical risk is regulated away. Reputational risk is managed through credentialism. The political career proceeds from law school, to staff position, to office, without a single point of contact with reality. The man who has never risked anything governs men who are no longer permitted to risk anything either. The Regime has produced a society where every consequence must be reversible and everyone replaceable. It is not just the death of competency but the death of meaning.

Will has a name. It can be praised, blamed, succeeded, opposed. Will produces decisions for which someone is responsible. A committee only produces the vector sum of the pressures applied by its members. This is why the Cult of Consensus exists: the committee needs a theology

that ratifies its outputs as legitimate, because the outputs have no author. This is why the system runs on reward functions instead of decisions. A reward function is what decides when no one decides. Will is what overrides functions in service of a greater plan. Without Will, the reward function is the telos by default. The Regime is the first political form ever invented that has no driver but only a stochastic optimizer sliding down whatever slope the geometry of pressures happens to present. Its policies are the local minima of factional gradient descent. The Regime's officeholders are not leaders in any meaningful sense. They are instruments of an optimization process in service of a machine no one has control over.

This is why nothing about our government feels designed. It isn't. The Regime simply slides down the path of least resistance. The duopoly fights, but neither party rules. Policy is reactive with no telos. Sovereignty diffused into nothing in particular. The Cult of Consensus produces "decisions" no one made. The political class adjacent to the law. No true succession method. No sovereign office even to be succeeded. The Regime is something worse than a conspiracy of hidden masters. We have the emperor's clothes, but there is no emperor. There is no man behind the curtain. Those who pretend to decide are all just cogs in the machine like the rest of us, yet they reap the rewards as if they owned us.

The process has become so corrupt that we have a persistent legitimacy crisis. Anyone who makes it to the top within the current system is tarnished by the very procedure that was supposed to legitimize them. Without anyone who could be seen as legitimate, we have nobody who could reform the system from within. Without reform, the process only gets more corrupted. This is what happens when no one decides.

The alternative cannot simply be a better optimizer. What comes after the Regime will not just be a more efficient committee, a wiser consensus, or a smarter algorithm. The successor will be what the Regime cannot do: decide. It will be a body whose responsibility is visible, whose consequences are paid, whose hand is known. The republic has been betrayed. Someone must avenge her.

We refuse to be nothing more than cogs in the machine. We Will what the Regime cannot Will, decide what the Regime cannot decide, and name what the Regime cannot bear to name.

We govern in advance of what we govern. Naming precedes the fact, the fact follows naming. The Founding Fathers did not wait for King George to permit their declaration. They named themselves a people, and then fought to prove it. Naming is the first political act.

We hold ourselves to be judged. We hold ourselves to be opposed.

The Regime hides because it cannot bear direct judgement. We declare that the only legitimate authority is the authority that can be seen, named, and answered for. We stand in plain sight before you.

We will avenge the republic.

Ascend Through the Spiral

What we have today is a society of permanent adolescents. Without the opportunity for generative risk and consequence, no one is allowed to grow up. There were never any "adults in the room." The Regime has produced a population incapable of replacing it. In doing so, it has produced a population also incapable of sustaining it. The future is sacrificed to protect the past. The Regime is Saturn devouring his children.

It can be remarked then with some irony how young our civilization is. The constitutional settlement is less than two and a half centuries old. Its appearance of age despite this is proof against the Regime's long-term viability. Rome governed itself, in continuous institutional descent, for over two thousand years. From the Republic, to the Principate, to the Eastern Empire. The architecture held and adapted

and preserved continuity through massive transformations for an unfathomably long time.

For three thousand years, the West produced its governing class through ordeal. The Roman aristocrat earned his position through military command, public office, and the visible expenditure of his own fortune in service of Rome. The medieval knight earned his place through physical courage, where failure meant death. The merchant class earned their station through capital investment risked, with no guarantee of return. The cleric sacrificed through renunciation. Each estate had its own ordeal. To climb the social ladder was to risk something.

The estates system was not invented in any one place. It emerged independently across medieval Europe: the three estates in France, the Cortes in Spain, the Reichstag in the Empire, Parliament in England, the Sejm in Poland. Different content, different cultures, same structural function. The convergence is not coincidental. It is evidence that functional representation by role and stake is discovered organizational technology: the answer that complex societies arrive at naturally when they are solving the real problem of how to represent different kinds of personal stake. It survived many centuries, much longer than the Regime has, and was only put away after hereditary succession had sufficiently degenerated the ruling class.

The Catholic Church is the longest continuously operating institution in Western history. Arguably, world history. It has outlasted every government it has ever coexisted with, every empire that has attempted to capture it, and every heresy that has attempted to replace it. It has institutional memory measured in millennia. It selects, forms, and reproduces its own governing class through defined ordeals, vows, formation, renunciation. It elects its sovereign through a college whose members are themselves the product of the institution. This is the gold standard of self-perpetuating governance.

These institutions survived stresses the Regime has never been tested against. Every crisis leaves the Regime more brittle, its flawed institutional logic stretched even further. It has been coasting, riding the inertia of the most significant technological revolution in human history, on what was effectively a continent-sized gold mine. America succeeded *despite* her government. The men who built America were ambitious, productive, dangerous men who would have been suffocated to death by any sufficiently mature state, as their descendants are today. The founders' genius being their failure to build such a state. There was always more land westward. There was always more capital to be made. There was always somewhere to flee from the institution that, given another century

of consolidation, would have caught up with them. That escape valve closed roughly a century ago. The frontier ended and the continent filled: the resources no longer effectively infinite. As American exceptionalism has expired, the institution it has been disguising began to reveal itself. What we are watching unfold in real time is not a sudden collapse. It is the Regime now finally making contact with the country that had spent two centuries outrunning it.

While America has been coasting on inheritance, another civilization has been performing the operation we now require. The Chinese Communist Party did not import Western liberal architecture. They modernized their own civilization's native organizational logic. The Mandarin system, their two thousand years of self-reproducing governing class formed through defined ordeal, was updated. The classic Confucian canon became the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist canon. The architecture persisted because it was solving a real civilizational problem and the Chinese understood that their answer to that problem was older and better tested than anything the Enlightenment had to offer them.

The result is one of the most dramatic state building successes in history. Continuous institutional coherence for three quarters of a century. One and a half billion people governed without the periodic constitutional crises that

punctuate American political life. Meanwhile our political class is incapable of executing the most basic functions of government. Their state has coherence, ours is only united in its disunity.

This is not a recommendation that we copy them. Their tradition is alien to ours and they have their own problems of which there are many. The CCP's ideological rigidity, information suppression, and its cycle of corruption and purges are all expressions of a single structural deficiency: the system has no legitimate channel through which reality can talk back to the governing class. It has poor epistemic hygiene. Doctrine doesn't get revised, information doesn't flow upward honestly, corruption doesn't get addressed transparently. These are problems that Functional Representation already solves: representation by role and stake, those who pay the price decide. Functional Representation isn't just a fairer system, it's a superior informational processing system. Real information is surfaced about real conditions because representatives have direct material stake in what they represent. The CCP and the Regime have parallel failure modes. Both govern through abstractions that cannot be falsified by reality because reality lacks accurate representation in their feedback loops. But what the Chinese have proven is that a civilization's native organizational logic can be properly modernized.

Finance is the technology by which capital is allocated across time and risk. A society that produces surplus must decide what to do with that surplus. It can be consumed, stored, or reinvested to produce more surplus. Finance is the apparatus that makes these decisions at scale. None of this is parasitic in itself. Without finance, a complex society cannot exist.

The purpose of finance is as a coordinating function, not a productive one. It allocates capital to those who do create value. When it allocates well, it amplifies the productive order. When it allocates poorly, it starves the productive order. The Regime inverted this relation. The coordinating apparatus has captured the productive order it was supposed to serve. The tail wags the dog. The men who allocate capital live outside the conditions their allocations create. Speculation has displaced investment. Asset prices have detached from underlying value. Bailouts socialize loss while privatizing gain. Finance under Functional Representation exists to serve the productive order. Financial decisions that destroy productive enterprise should destroy the financial actors who make them. Without consequence, allocation does not improve. Without improvement, finance isn't performing its function, it's performing extraction.

The Regime accidentally built a technology for economic coordination more powerful

than pure market economies or pure planned economies, and it cannot use it to its full extent because the Regime is by nature uncoordinated. This technology gets wasted on protecting the rent-seeking monopolies of oligarchs.

Regulation, as it currently exists, is a system that shapes economic activity at every level: production standards, capital flows, market access, labor terms, environmental requirements, professional licensing. Both the libertarian right and the socialist left fundamentally misdescribe today's economy because both are fighting yesterday's ideological war. The libertarian sees regulation as the corruption of an underlying market, the socialist sees the market as the corruption of an underlying plan. Both miss that there is a third thing here that uses market mechanisms for information and incentive but operates within centrally engineered constraints. The Regime built this, but the Regime doesn't understand the power of what it built.

The tragedy is that this technology has no director to wield it. Regulation under the Regime is captured by the regulated industries themselves, written by lobbyists for the firms that will be subject to it, used to throttle competition rather than to coordinate production, optimized for financial extraction rather than productive output just like everything else. The most sophisticated coordination technology ever built and it runs on disjointed fragments captured

by petty factional interests. It's a commandless command economy. Another face of the system that decides without a decider, plans without a planner, and coordinates without coordination.

Our position is that we treat regulation as what it actually is: game design. The economy is just a game and the regulations are the rules for it. Players will always try to min-max the most reward out of the current game environment. Set the rules poorly and you get degenerate play where everyone defects. Set them well and the players are optimized to choose behaviors that benefit the good of the public. The Regime built a corruption loop. Today's rules get written by yesterday's winners. Last year's regulatory capturers select next year's regulators. Last year's tax beneficiaries fund the campaigns of next year's tax writers. Bailout recipients lobby for more bailouts. This process has been recursive for generations and the whole process has become completely inbred. The rules are optimized to reward those who have already won and starve any competition that might replace them. The only move to break the loop is to separate winning from authorship, and bring the regulatory architecture under the design and direction of a Will that cannot be bought.

Will, unlike consensus, is not a coercive preference aggregation loop.

Will is a vector. It's the act of choosing among possibilities. Of all the things that the Regime

lacks, this is the most significant. The lack of Will makes course correction very very expensive. The new state will have a sovereign leader. But a sovereign leader need not be a dictator. He can't be. That mistake has been made enough times. But it is a false binary that the choices are either no sovereign or tyranny. The Pope is a sovereign. He is elected, he is accountable to his polity, and he follows 2000 years of continued lawful succession. This is the institutional tradition to follow, not the autocrat, not the dictator.

The greatest single failure point for sovereign executives, and one of the most commonly recurring ones, is micromanagement. That is, making decisions on the operational level. The Sovereign exists to have taste and to delegate. He sets the direction for the polity on its most abstract level. He exists to decide when someone has to. When the daily function of the state is impeded, he makes the exception, he clears the way. That a sovereign ought to be even allowed to micromanage the state is lunacy. He is the ideas guy of the realm.

The sovereign's job, beyond having taste and delegating, is to ensure coherence and success of the polity's trajectory on a historical timeframe. To oversee the transition from past, to present, to future. To design, to authorize decisions whose consequences extend far beyond any electoral cycle or single lifetime. The cathedral, intercontinental infrastructure

projects, long-horizon projects of historical importance. Will operates, and can be passed from successor to successor, on time horizons that consensus cannot reach.

Since the architecture constraining the sovereign office of the new state largely prevents him from over-deciding, the main failure point of dictators, kings, and other autocratic rulers, this failure point inevitably gets passed down to subordinates. It is they, now, who are making operational-level decisions. Their micro-tyranny is prevented, structurally, by being easily appointed and removed, being subject to judgement from above and not just below. They are retainers as much as they are executives.

There ought to be a graceful, honorable retirement for officers who underperform. Punishment for regular failure produces a culture in which failure is hidden and accumulates. Punishment should be reserved for corruption, treason, and betrayal.

The Church has understood for thousands of years that men with property cannot be incorruptible because property generates interests independent of the order they serve. The Regime's political class has the property problem grossly unsolved. American politicians enter middle-class and leave rich, sometimes filthy rich. It is the alignment of the political career with the financial interests of those who

fund it. The political class is not just corrupt, it is structurally compromised by the property relation itself. They own the same assets that benefit from the policies they pass. They retire into the firms of the interests they served. Their children are credentialed into the same class. The loop is recursive across generations and the political class becomes a hereditary aristocracy dressed in the garb of democracy.

The only full solution to this problem is a defined political class that is banned from owning property beyond the personal. No bank account. No land. Nothing. There can be no half measures. This is their renunciation. They will be like monks who subsist off the Church's property. If a political class that subsists entirely off of public works wants to enrich itself, the only legal way to do so will be to create better, more beautiful public works. Everyone wins. Corruption for a public servant is a travesty. Ownership of money or property beyond the personal will be punished by indefinite expulsion and imprisonment. For the public servant the tie of property itself inherently creates a conflict of interest between the public good and his own interest. "Ye cannot serve God and mammon."[1]

America already functions as a one-party state in everything but name. The pretense of

1. Matthew 6:24, KJV

party competition is the cover under which the unitary system operates. Because the duopoly is dishonest about what it is, it cannot be designed for the public good. Design requires intention. Intention requires acknowledgement of what the thing even is. A one-party state that pretends to be a multi-party democracy can only operate by accident, and its accidents are optimized for the parasitic class because the parasitic class is the only constituency organized and powerful enough to take advantage of and direct the accidents. The duopoly's incoherence is the immutable structural consequence of refusing to admit what the system is.

We propose a constitutionally integrated political class, organized as a single institution: the Popular Party, with defined membership, defined formation, defined renunciations, defined succession. The party is not a private association competing for office under the constitution. The Popular Party is a constitutional organ, part of the designed architecture itself. There is no political class outside the Popular Party. There are no second masters. There is no auction of nominations. There is nowhere to defect to. The political class will be visible, legible, and responsible to the public. The order is one. The vocation is one. The only rewards there can be for a public servant are increased responsibility, and the honor and glory in serving the people well.

The Regime will try to brand us authoritarians. It will be the first word the hypocrites reach for. The charge presumes that what we have now is freedom, that the duopoly is liberty, that unaccountable agencies is liberty, that the political class enriching itself is liberty, that the citizen reduced to a signature on decisions made elsewhere is liberty.

The Sovereign of our design is structurally prevented from making the operational decisions that define every actual authoritarianism. The Regime's executive rules with no such constraint. Congress passes a vague enabling statute, and an unelected agency fills in the substance. The EPA alone effectively writes as much law in a year as Congress does in a decade. Functional Representation will make the new government answerable to the people in a way the federal system hasn't for as long as anyone has been alive. Our political class will be bound to serve the public interest, barred from owning property entirely, while the Regime's political class is defined by its inherent conflicts of interest. We have solved the corruption problem the Regime can't even name. We will provide a succession that is lawful and continuous, where the Regime's rotation of staff is a four-year convulsion of a state at war with itself.

The Regime's thinking is that the only thing stopping authoritarianism is procedure. This is a fallacy. This logic gave us the Cult of Consensus

theology and the hidden privatization of the state into an authoritarian plutocracy. The constraint that prevents tyranny is ontological. A sovereign who derives authority from the republic and converts the republic into his own personal property destroys the source of his authority. The Regime's unnamed sovereign has quietly done this and gradually forsaken the trust of the people it depends on to govern. The Roman emperors who understood this, who maintained the forms and functions of the republic, generally governed well for decades and died quietly in their beds. The emperors who forgot this, who began treating the state as their own personal property, were typically killed by their own praetorian guard. Not because the guard had removal authority, but because the emperor had destroyed his own legitimacy. The only source left of his power was force, and force gets answered with force.

The evidence of this in our own time is January 6th. Trump had the mob, the moment, and enough institutional confusion that a more determined man might've pushed through. He did not, though there was no procedural mechanism to physically stop him. The Constitution, the vice president, the police. None of them stopped him. The procedure only named the line. What stopped him was the implicit understanding that crossing that line

would've forfeited his constitutionally sanctified legitimacy. Trump would become a usurper.

The usurper, the dictator, who has made a new order entirely dependent on his personal force is maximally endangered. The entire system depends on him, and its opponents have a single high-value target: kill him and everything stops. Caesar is the archetypal story. Yet if an attempt were made against Augustus, the system would go on, and the assassins would be immediately subject to the wrath of whatever faction backed the succession. The Sovereign who understands this has a direct personal interest in building truly functional institutions beneath him rather than dependencies. Every institution that can operate without him is armor. Maintaining and advancing the interests of the institutions that give him legitimacy prevents him from relying on crude force.

The Pope holds total authority within his domain. He is elected, accountable to that institution, sovereign, and constrained by the same ontological logic: the Church does not belong to him. It belongs to Christ and the faithful, His body. To convert it into the Pope's property would be to forfeit the thing that gives him power in the first place. The Church has had some bad leaders over its 2000 years. It has had crises. It has survived every single one of them without collapsing or being turned into a kind of

dictatorship. It has survived for an unfathomably long time.

Likewise, our new state will not belong to the Sovereign, it will belong to the people. The Sovereign holds it in trust, deriving his authority from a source he cannot possess and cannot destroy without destroying himself. This is far more republican than what presently exists. The Regime's hidden sovereign owns the state in fact while denying ownership in name. Our Sovereign holds the state in trust, and acknowledges that trust in name.

The Regime has betrayed the liberal project. It has privatized what was supposed to be for the public. There is no faction within the Regime with any intention of restoring what belongs to the people. We are the only liberals left. The Regime calls itself liberal when it is not. It has abandoned liberty in everything but diction. It is a despotism of delay, denial, and deflection. We are returning liberalism to its first principles: power made visible, authority made lawful, office made accountable, and government once again bound to the will of the governed.

The administrative design philosophy of the Popular Party is a spiral. The same principles ascend through every altitude: visible authority, functional representation, renunciation of the political class, decision authority running downward and information running upward. Each altitude performs its own work that no other

altitude can perform. The school board is not a small Sovereign. The central government is not a large school board. They are different stations on a single ascending architecture, each doing only what it can do, all governed by the same operating principles.

The prefecture model has proven to work and it should be a reference point when designing the new administrative architecture. Japan has operated under it since the Meiji Restoration. France has operated some version of it since Napoleon. Neither has produced the same kind of administrative dysfunction the American federal system has produced over comparable periods. The model is not novel and it is not theoretical. It is demonstrated, durable, and well understood.

The difference from the American federal system is that the prefecture is an administrative subdivision of a unified state, not a competing decision maker. Each prefecture has a governor and an assembly. There is no question of which level holds final authority because the question is not architecturally available. Different prefectures administer the same national policy adapted to different local conditions and the state remains coherent.

The prefecture model is a strong starting point but it is not designed with the demands the Popular Party will make on the architecture. It scales across territory within a single nation. It does not pair the territorial dimension with a

parallel architecture for representing function. It is not designed for adaptability across time and scale at the rate adaptation now requires.

What we propose is a unitary state divided vertically into tiered territorial administrative levels and divided horizontally where major social functions report upward through their own organs. In practice, this means that every layer of government would have three organs, an executive administrator, a territorial governing body reporting local territorial conditions, and a functional assembly reporting the conditions of social functions. The prefect executes national direction downward, the assemblies carry organized knowledge upward. The state will see both the map and the machinery of society.

The territorial channel and the functional channel report on overlapping conditions through entirely different chains of accountability. Vertically, the borough reports to the city, which reports to the prefecture, which reports to the province, which reports to the national district, which reports to the center. Horizontally, there is a separate structure for each major function: agriculture, energy, industry, transport, education, policing, finance, health, science, culture, etc. At every altitude where both channels operate, the information can be cross-checked at the point of overlap. The school board has a territorial position (the local district) and a functional position (education

as a function). At each step up the ladder, the territorial reporting and the functional reporting can be checked against each other. The executive authority at any altitude has multiple independent reports on conditions within its scope that can be triangulated and discrepancies investigated.

At the level of the borough and the city, direct election is operationally meaningful in a way that it ceases to be at higher altitudes. The polity is small enough that residents can plausibly know the candidates personally, evaluate them on direct evidence, and be governed by them in ways that correspond to local conditions the residents themselves experience. There is also a vocational reason for preserving local elections. The political class needs to be recruited from somewhere, and local political experience is a natural proving ground. A city councilor who demonstrates competence and is recognized by the local apparatus as suitable for promotion within the political class can ascend through the spiral. Local elections function partly as a talent identification mechanism.

However, local administration as the recruitment ground for the political class inherently produces a brain drain at the local level that must be corrected. The competent get promoted upward through the spiral and the local apparatus is left with whoever did not advance. Every existing system that uses local government

as a training ground suffers from it, including the American federal system.

Our proposed solution to this problem has two components. Firstly, make an age ceiling on entry into the political class to prevent the seniority pipeline from getting clogged. Secondly, make a retirement age for high office, but no retirement age for local offices. This prevents gerontocracy at the top, and also brings talent back to the local level. Local government gets to be both a proving ground for young men of the political class, and a place for the elderly experienced statesmen to retire to and transmit their knowledge. This doesn't just preserve talent at every institutional level, but creates a natural continuity of institutional memory. With this problem solved, the question of selection at each altitude can be specified.

The functional estates elect their representatives from within at every altitude. The information flowing upward through the functional channel is filtered through the estate's own competency judgments. Those voting to represent their functions will always have a direct stake in the elections, and have at least a baseline level of experience to judge their representatives. This isn't the case for the territorial dimension.

Above the local levels, the borough and the city, general territorial elections cease to be meaningful mechanisms for achieving representation. The prefect, the regional

administrator, the national administrator, these positions are appointed from above through the chain that runs from the Sovereign down. This is entirely structurally necessary. An elected prefect would have a constituency distinct from the central government's and would be structurally tempted towards repeating the mistakes of the federal system through other means. The polity at this level is too large, too diverse, too strategically complex, and too distant from ordinary public life for any electorate to meaningfully evaluate candidates. We would return to the same problem of the officeholder representing people with "nothing in common but a zip code." We would run into the same problem of preference aggregation. The representative's interests would be necessarily captured. Representation would drift to whoever can move the aggregate, not to the polity that the aggregate purports to represent.

The body that elects the sovereign is constituted by a body of the party's most elite officers entering the prime of their career. Structurally similar to the College of Cardinals, they elect a member from within. The papal model succeeds at continuity, legitimacy, and elite selection, but fails on sclerosis, gerontocracy, informational decay, poor integration between elector and governing brain, and suboptimal distribution of experience across the whole of the organization. Our model for sovereign selection

corrects the papal model at every known failure point.

Our college should be composed of men under the age of 40. This is a role for younger men in their intellectual prime who have proven peak aptitude. This college is not primarily an electoral body. The election of the Sovereign is a rare event within the college's other work. Its function is the legal and intellectual general staff of the sovereign's office: to be involved in all branches of government, executive, legislative, and judiciary, and across all domains. The college is the hand of the Sovereign. The college's members might rotate through different roles during their decade or so of service, investigation, prosecution, administration, legal drafting and review, etc. The sovereign serves long enough to have strategic perspective, with the surrounding institutional brain refreshing rapidly enough to prevent sclerosis.

As this body is responsible for electing the next sovereign from within itself, there is a direct cultural, intellectual, and strategic continuity from one Sovereign to the next. Despite their youth, the members of the college are uniquely qualified for selecting the next Sovereign from within their own ranks, due to observing each other performing the demanding work across all areas of government, and personally working alongside the Sovereign himself. They are evaluating potential candidates for the apex

position from the position just below the apex. Their decision is therefore better informed than any alternative.

The Sovereign is elected from among the college's members during his own college tenure. He assumes office in his late twenties or thirties, at the moment of cognitive prime, with potentially three or four decades of governance ahead of him. Most college members may never participate in an election. They will spend their decade or so in the college doing the college's other work and then exit to other roles within the government for the prime of their career proper, carrying with them the experience and intellectual formation built during their college service. The party career must be designed so that there is no terminal endpoint where all experience and talent gets sucked into one organ of government.

One potential blueprint of the new state is as follows. One sovereign office, whose officeholder carries total responsibility for the state's decisions. His job is closer to a supreme legislator than a supreme executive. The Sovereign's job isn't to manage the day-to-day operations of the state like a normal head of state. He designs the rules of the game from outside of it. If the rulemaker is beholden to yesterday's rules, then yesterday's rules are the author of tomorrow's rules, with the rulemaker only as an instrument of yesterday's rules. The

Sovereign needs to not have factional, career, or political interests that shape his decision making. He is not supposed to be a political player. Those who actually play the game, that is, those who do the governing during normal operations, are playing within the rules that he creates. Beneath the Sovereign, a familiar separation of powers.

There is a Chief Secretary, the chief administration officer who assumes the administrative responsibilities similar to those of the President under the present U.S. federal system. The House of Representatives is replaced by a House of Functional Representatives. Senators are elected by party members. The judiciary should be split into two bodies: an advisory council of elders that also handles constitutional review, and a high court for appellate jurisdiction.

A good Sovereign ought to let the government function on its own during ordinary conditions. He's structurally incentivized against micromanaging. Micromanagement creates room for making personal failures in judgment with almost zero potential upside. Though he delegates responsibility, the ultimate decision authority should rest clearly and unambiguously with him. The legislature's passage of a bill is not the completion of a legislative act. It's a recommendation backed by the information of those who know. The Sovereign's assent is what makes it law. Any law or constitutional

amendment should be required, except in the case of emergency, to pass through the legislature and the council and be reviewed as a formality before being signed into law by the Sovereign. There will always be a sovereign body within any state, and it is in the best interest of the democratic process that it be as publicly legible and accountable as possible.

The legislature still writes and debates the laws, the executive still administers the laws, the judiciary still rules on the laws, but the people know that every decision is from the Sovereign: that he has ultimate decision-making responsibility.

To be judged well by history, we must do more than take power and build institutions. We must build the men and women who will inhabit and embody those institutions.

The new order cannot recruit from a population trained for compliance. The functional estates cannot represent vocations the schools have refused to honor. Everything proposed in this document depends on raising children differently than the Regime raises them.

The Regime's school works tolerably for the student who fits its mold: textually intelligent, sequentially patient, above all compliant. For every other student it does almost nothing but issue, at the end, a certificate of completion whose value declines with every passing year. The system mistakes equal dignity for identical

treatment, and identical treatment produces unequal failure. The academically gifted are slowed down. The practically gifted are bored. The physically courageous are domesticated. "No Child Left Behind" leaves children behind because it refuses to ask what kind of formation each child uniquely requires.

Our principle is singular: education must be differentiated rather than uniform. Formation means working with the material you have. A common foundation is owed to every child. Beyond it, the path forks: academic, technical, vocational, martial, civic, each track with its own gate, its own path, its own dignity. By the middle teenage years, students should be encountering real choices, real standards, and real consequences under supervision. We will stop preventing young people from becoming adults.

Higher learning must be returned from the terminal point of a credentialing hierarchy to the intellectually serious. The university is not supposed to be a four-year summer camp for the developmentally arrested. It should be for those dedicated to higher study, whatever path brought them there.

The Regime has raised a compliant mass of credentialed consumers. The successor order must raise functional adults: those who will bear the weight of civilization as it grows heavier and carry it forward. In the age that lies ahead, this work becomes a world-historical task.

American Eschaton

The world is aspirationally American. We are the ideal the world holds up, whether we always embody that ideal or not. We're what the world measures itself against. American culture, American capital, American technology, American military, American language. These are exported worldwide. The world is not divided between those who want to be American and those who do not. The world is divided between those who admit they want to be American and those who pretend otherwise while consuming American media, wearing American clothes, using American technology, and seeking American education for their children. The pretense of resistance is mostly performance. What looks like anti-Americanism is usually just local elites managing their relationship within their orbit of America.

America already runs the world. The only question is whether we are honest with ourselves about what we are doing or whether we continue to pretend, in the manner of the Regime, that

we are only "promoting democracy" or defending some neutral international architecture from which we accidentally derive disproportionate benefit. We are not. We are the world's imperial center. The dollar is the world's reserve currency. The American military is the World Police. American culture is consumed globally. English is spoken globally, especially among the youth. American capital sets the terms on which the rest of the world's enterprise operates. This is what we are. Pretending otherwise is the same dishonesty the Regime practices about everything. It produces the same dysfunction: a state that can't govern what it is because it can't see what it is.

Political factions like the libertarians and paleoconservatives argue for withdrawal. Withdrawal is not possible. Our economy, which runs on consumption, speculation, and intellectual property, depends on our hegemon status. Its structure is downstream of American military and monetary supremacy. Withdraw from the hegemony and the dollar collapses, the consumption economy collapses, global credit collapses. Isolationism is an insane fantasy. American interventionism has been disastrous because the Regime is dysfunctional. This is a temporary organizational problem. Frankly, America being world hegemon is a great problem to have, and our only strategic move forward is to roll with it.

We didn't get here by accident. America hit the moment of total leverage in 1945, the only opportunity like it in history. The European powers were destroyed, the Soviets exhausted, the Japanese occupied, the British Empire bankrupt. The continent was hollowed out, the oceans were ours, and we held the only nuclear weapons on Earth.

And we flinched. The men who might've used the moment decisively toward world peace were not equal to the hour. We had just spent countless lives in destroying every rival power on Earth, and all we built was a global architecture of permanent non-decision dressed in 19th-century vocabulary. Sovereign equality of nation-states. Spheres of influence. Balance of power. Multilateral consensus. The Westphalian framework that had been functionally dead for decades was dug up and its corpse preserved as the operating fiction of the postwar order. Meanwhile America behaves as an imperial hegemon in denial. It's hedging. It's cowardice. It's the pathology of the Regime exported worldwide. It's the refusal to author history.

What we've got is a permanently iterative world where the game never ends. Every regional conflict is another round. Every crisis is managed instead of resolved. The Regime decided it would rather bomb an assortment of foreign countries for 80 years because that was emotionally safer than ripping the band-aid off and building

something. The flinching from 1945 is still compounding over 80 years later.

What we are living in is in the long shadow of an interrupted project. The concept of rights and liberty. The eradication of deadly diseases. The end of food scarcity. Marvels of engineering. Electrical power flowing through the veins of every city on the continent. Flying machines that punch through the sound barrier. We put a man on the moon. "The moon in the fucking sky?"[1] We spent centuries solving every problem and breaking through every boundary we could find one at a time. We did this routinely. Constantly. Every day was one small step closer to a better world. That was modernity.

That optimism brought us two world wars that ended with a long standoff between nuclear powers that threatened humanity with global extinction. The postmodern critique was correct about a great deal of what it said. When your civilization's highest achievements are turned toward industrial slaughter, you stop believing in your civilization's promises. The critique was the coping mechanism for the shock and it radiated through the culture. Progress has victims. Neutral procedure isn't neutral. Universal claims are used to mask particular interests. The truth is my truth and your truth. That was honest intellectual work.

---

1. Karl Marx, *Twitter*

But the postmodern paradigm is increasingly exhausted. The game is past being solved. The endless critique, subversion, irony, and deconstruction that were claimed to liberate us from the rigid oppression of tradition have become our new cage. Continuing the postmodern critique is no longer doing real discovery. It's only preventing the next move.

The only factions who have tried to succeed postmodernity so far have been doing so from a position that's already lost. Every postwar attempt to return to pre-postmodern certainty, nationalism, traditionalism, identitarianism, etc, has failed on the same grounds. They have no answer to the civilizational rebuttal that defeated their predecessors. Even worse, many of them operate within the cultural malaise postmodernity brought. A lot of today's reactionaries hold their own beliefs with a certain kind of self-aware irony.

Irony is catastrophe insurance held as an aesthetic posture. It's one of the strongest cultural phenomena of the postmodern era. It's pervasive. Everywhere are people performing some kind of self-aware detachment. Hedging their bets. Refusing to fully decide. The civilization that nearly destroyed the world in the name of its convictions birthed a culture that has decided to never believe anything too strongly again. You can't usher in a new era when you're still working inside of the previous era's socio-cultural tech.

Especially when its conclusion is to do nothing with seriousness and never commit.

There have been attempts to defeat the cultural pervasiveness of irony but none of them work. "Post-irony" is not post irony. It's sincerity performed with the same self-aware detachment. Innocence lost cannot be regained. What's missing is a fundamental shift in public mindset and attitude. The postmodern man holds outcome at a distance. We must collapse that distance.

We can't return to sincerity through forfeiting awareness. But that isn't our only option. "If a man is prepared to accept a loss from the outset, he cannot be beaten."[2] The solution is prospective *amor fati.* To love one's future fate. To embrace the superposition of all possible outcomes as valid and eat the risk. We build the Tower of Babel knowing God will smite it down. And we build it anyway, knowing he can't have unbuilt it.

This mindset may be called *Hyperfatalist*, that is, to go beyond fatalism, not in the sense of "extra fatalism." To love and embrace one's destiny, rather than to resign oneself to it. The gods at the twilight do not sulk because of their prophesied fate; they ride out to meet their doom with gusto to die well.

---

2. Yamamoto Tsunetomo, *Hagakure*

You make the decision. From that point the die is cast. Whether you win, lose, or nothing happens, you have already committed fully.

"A real man does not think of victory or defeat. He plunges recklessly towards an irrational death. By doing this, you will awaken from your dreams."[3]

The world we've been living in hates men who act. In a consensus-governed system, agency itself is transgressive. Notice how in most of today's fiction, the villain is always the character with a plan, and the hero is a blank slate defending the status quo. The collective unconscious trains itself culturally to see agency as suspect.

This is why figures like Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos are objects of common resentment regardless of their actual outputs. They are not just resented because they are rich. Many rich people are tolerated. They are resented because they act. They author things. The culture around us shaped by the Regime's Cult of Consensus theology experiences this as a kind of blasphemy.

Musk is the cleanest case. He is a genuine disruptor. He makes risky bets against current market conditions and wins. But the Regime can still contain him. Musk shows the limits of agency under the current order. His Mars fixation is platonic. It is almost as out there

3. Yamamoto Tsunetomo, *Hagakure*

as a purely religious motivation and works on him like one. He's reorganizing industries in a way that meaningfully contributes to space industrialization, but the scale of his ambitions is orders of magnitude greater than anything he will be capable of doing personally. Interplanetary civilization, Mars colonization. It's theoretically possible. But the energy it's going to take to do that exceeds the surplus output of any state actor in the current geopolitical arena, let alone a private actor. Consolidating the labor and resources of Earth is a prerequisite.

Under the Regime, the Mars dream is just escapism. The flight to Mars as a civilizational project emerges precisely when fixing Earth feels politically impossible. We do not yet have a coherent civilization on the only planet we currently occupy. Proposing to extend to another planet, when we don't have the means to follow through on it, is another way of refusing the call to action.

That there's the will to do it anyway is a sign of the coming era. Postmodernity is exhausted. Ambitions are exceeding what its institutional carriers can work with. The *Hypermodern* Age is approaching.

This is not a prediction. The hypermodern world is coming whether or not we become its civilizational carrier. China is doing the operation. Other parts of the world are starting to experiment with it. Private actors are forcing it

into existence. The technologies that will define the next century, AI, biotechnology, advanced materials, fusion, space industrialization, are arriving on a timeline shorter than the Regime could ever adapt to. It hasn't even finished adapting to the technologies of yesteryear. There are offices in the country that still operate on paper files and copying machines from the 70s. A new order must emerge in America. The window isn't going to be open forever. The failure to act following World War II set an expiration date. Either America solves her identity crisis soon or we become spectators for a future built by others.

It's been debated for as long as this country has been around who gets to be an American. We say everyone should be an American. Because at this point, why not? It's the logical conclusion of everything that we've built and the only productive answer to the situation we're presently in. We're already the imperial center of a diverse globe-spanning civilization. We might as well own it.

Universalism is liberalism's principle zero. Everything else liberalism claims, liberty, equality before law, the rights of the individual, is an application of universality. Without universality, rights are only privileges of station, which is what they were before, and where they're headed back to under the Regime, which preaches subjectivity while practicing a confused hypocritical universalism. Universality

was proven to be a fiction, a particular in disguise, a Western bourgeois liberal interest, and everyone drew the wrong inference: that universalism was therefore impossible, so either perform it cynically or drop it for your preferred particular. We've always had the option right there to just make it real: to build a real, particular universalism. This is the only logical conclusion to the postmodern paradigm that isn't stepping backwards.

Every objection to building a universal order from within the liberal tradition comes from within liberalism's betrayal of itself. The paleoconservative who argues for retreat is arguing against universality. The moderate liberal who argues for intervention over integration is arguing for tiered liberalism – against universality. "Everyone should be an American" is the only logically consistent application of "all men are created equal"[4] once the technological conditions for universal participation exist.

To be American is to be rich. To be American is to be powerful. It's to be beautiful. It's to be industrious. Positive. Outgoing. Educated. Adventurous. To say yes to life. To say an American is anything other than an aspirational ideal at this point is just descriptively false. Every other theory has been proven false in fact.

---

4. Declaration of Independence, 1776

It is no wonder that the world wants to be American. Who wouldn't? We say let them. We say if the world wants to be American, America should come to them. There is always more work to do. More mountains to climb. Anyone who embraces the aspiration of America: we can find a job for you.

That is the strength of Functional Representation. Everyone has a function they can fulfill within the productive order. If there is someone who wants to work, but can't, that is not a personal failure, but a failure of the system. The Regime built a society that's cannibalizing itself. They've regulated us into the illusion of scarcity: that more workers means more competition for finite resources and opportunities. With a system that can adapt, more labor means more production means more abundance.

Unlike the federal system, where representation gets diluted by geography, and expansion creates superlinear administrative burden, our system can be designed to scale from the beginning. This is what hosting the hypermodern age means. Designing for scale so we can build at scale.

The American city can once again be a place where public life is possible. We surrendered it to parking lots and arterials, to zoning codes that forbid the things that the human animal actually needs, to a half century of architectural cowardice that produced buildings that are an

affront to even the idea of taste. Meanwhile the cities the Chinese are building, and the Gulf is building, and parts of the developing world are building mock our surrender. The bullet train. The fifteen-minute city. The skyline drawn with intention. Arcology. Terraforming. Megastructures. None of this is technically beyond us. None of this is economically beyond us. We have the capital. We have the labor. We have the engineering. All we're missing is someone to wipe their ass with the Constitution, flush it down the toilet of history, and finally put the good people of America back to work.

That is the *American Eschaton*. This is the moment we stop lying to ourselves about what we are. The moment we realize what we were always becoming. Our destiny is to be the vessel for history's completion. This is what the entire liberal project has been building toward. A world where human dignity is equal, universal, and without border. An end to the millennia of local power struggles. The gathering of a global civilization into one productive order to build the beautiful world of the future humanity has dreamed of for so long.

We will make the future real again. We will show a numb generation how to believe in tomorrow, and in themselves, no matter what tomorrow brings.

That's the mission. That's the Popular Party.